



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/262,743	03/05/1999	MARI NATORI	02887.0136	9908
22852	7590	07/05/2005		EXAMINER
				KENDALL, CHUCK O
		FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2192

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/262,743	NATORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chuck Kendall	2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/08/2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

Detailed Action

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/05/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. USPN 6,249,905 B1 in view of Paul Dustin Keefer "AN OBJECT ORIENTED FRAMEWORK FOR ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS", Published 1994, (hereinafter "Keefer").

Regarding claim 1, Yoshida discloses a method for constructing a business application system by using a framework described by an object-oriented language, the method comprising the steps of:

preparing an abstract class group including (i) a system core class group, which

has abstractly defined a basic structure and behavior of a business application system (7:59 – 61, see single super class (abstract class)) that includes a screen system function for inputting data through a screen (6:5 – 20, see GUI for ACCOUNTS system and on lines 6: 34 – 35 see input icon), a business logic system function for executing at least calculation or aggregation on the basis of the data inputted by the screen system function (see FIG. 7c, input 74, salary 76a, overtime pay 76b and Total pay 77c) and (ii) a screen system class group, and a business logic system class group, which respectively inherit said system core class group, wherein said three system class groups are related to each other through said system core class group so that said report system class group and said business logic system class group can start and terminate their processing on the basis of the data inputted through the screen provided by the screen system class group (7: 55 – 63, also for start and terminate process see 6:37 – 40, for inputting for start process and lines 53 – 55 for proceeding according to sequences i.e., terminating);

inheriting said screen system class group, said report system class group and said business logic system class group of said abstract class group to prepare a screen system functional group, a report system functional group and a business logic system functional group (7: 55 – 63, shows all reuse program having same interface through inheritance);

inheriting said system core class group of said abstract class group to prepare a system core functional group (7: 55 – 63, see super class and subclass, equivalent function); and

integrating said screen system functional group, said business logic system functional group and said system core functional group (7: 55 – 63, all reuse components share the same interface and are all subclasses under the main ACCOUNTING super class).

Although, Yoshida doesn't expressly disclose a report system function for printing a report on the basis of the data inputted by the screen system function or a said report system functional group, Yoshida does mention in his background that in new ACCOUNTS system, Queries may be generated from a graphic user interface (GUI) tool, from reports such as bank statements, monthly record of sales etc. (2: 37 – 41) and he discloses use of sales, inventory and invoices in FIG. 2.

However, Keefer does disclose in an analogous art and similar configuration in an ACCOUNTING system on page 80, section 6.7, that a report-writing tool could be hooked to the transaction definition. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yoshida and Keefer because, adding report writing tools to the framework would increase its functionality (Keefer, pg 80, section 6.7).

Regarding claim 2, the method for constructing a business application system as set forth in claim 1, further comprising the step of preparing a common component group including plurality of common components commonly for use in said business application system, each of said common components having an interface with said abstract class group (Yoshida, 3: 8 – 12, see existing reuse components).

Regarding claim 3, the method for constructing a business application system as forth in claim 1, wherein each of said system core class group, said screen system class group, said report system class group and said business logic system class group includes a plurality of abstract classes having a hierarchical structure based on at least one inheritance relationship (Yoshida, see FIG. 1, which shows a hierarchical structure also see 4: 55 – 65).

Regarding claim 4, Yoshida discloses the method for constructing a business application system as applied in claim 1 above. Although, Yoshida doesn't expressly disclose abstract and concrete methods specifically, Yoshida does disclose the use of methods which he calls member functions (7: 25 – 30) within his class or objects defined by the class. However, Keefer in an analogous art and similar environment does in fact disclose primary methods (abstract methods) and internal Attribute methods (concrete methods) within classes (see Keefer, pg 21 4th paragraph, for primary method makeNewAccount also see, pg 30 3rd paragraph). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yoshida and Keefer because, the use of methods in an object oriented language is a general practice and enables one to properly invoke class members.

Regarding claim 5, the method for constructing a business application system as set forth in claim 1, wherein said integrating step compiles and links said screen system

functional group, said report system function group, said business logic system functional group and said system core functional group (Yoshida, 9:32 – 35, see compilation and execution).

Regarding claim 6, the method for constructing a business application system as set forth in claim 1, wherein said integrating step incorporates and screen system functional group, said report system functional group, said business logic system functional group and said system core functional group by means of a previously prepared inherent interface (Yoshida, 6:10 – 15, for previously prepared inherent interface see reuse program components saved for later use).

Regarding claim 7, which discloses the computer-readable version of claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 8, which discloses the computer-readable version of claim 2, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 9, which discloses the computer-readable version of claim 3, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 10, which discloses the computer-readable version of claim 4, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 11, which discloses the computer-readable version of claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 12, the computer-readable storage medium as set forth in claim 11, wherein said system core class group has defined the calling of a common component commonly for use in said business application system (Yoshida, see 7: 55 – 63, for reuse components).

Regarding claim 13, which also discloses the computer-readable version of claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CK.



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER